arXiv:1408.1729v2 [math.NA] 30 Mar 2015

DISCRETE ALEKSANDROV SOLUTIONS OF THE MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATION

GERARD AWANOU

Abstract. We give the first proof of convergence, in the classical sense, of a finite difference scheme to the Aleksandrov solution of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation. Discrete analogues of the Aleksandrov theory of the Monge-Ampère equation are derived.

1. Introduction

In this paper we are interested in the weak solution, in the sense of Aleksandrov, of the Dirichlet problem of the Monge-Ampère equation

$$\begin{aligned} \det D^2 u &= \nu \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &= g \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

on a convex bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with boundary $\partial\Omega$. It is assumed that ν is a finite Borel measure and $g \in C(\partial\Omega)$ can be extended to a convex function $\tilde{g} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$. The domain is not assumed to be strictly convex. Under these assumptions, (1.1) is known to have a unique convex Aleksandrov solution $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ [11, Theorem 1.1]. We develop a discrete version of the Aleksandrov notion of weak solution which results in finite difference analogues $M_h[u_h]$ of the Monge-Ampère measure $\det D^2 u$.

Given a sequence f_h of mesh functions which converge weakly to ν as measures, the problems $M_h[u_h] = f_h$ with $u_h = g$ on $\partial\Omega$ are shown to have unique solutions which converge uniformly on compact subsets to the Aleksandrov solution u of (1.1).

Our strategy consists in associating to a mesh function, discrete analogues of the normal mapping. This leads to wide stencil finite difference schemes. The 9-point stencil version of our first discretization, takes a very simple form on a square. Our second discretization of the normal mapping turns out to be the one used in [4] at selected mesh points.

Our discretizations provide a theoretical link between the geometric approach [18, 7] and the finite difference approach to the numerical resolution of the Monge-Ampère equation [6]. This connection has been implicitly exploited in [4] where at points where f_h above vanishes the discretization of [6] is used. A consequence of our results is a convergence proof for the discretization used in [4]. We refer to [4] for numerical experiments.

Convergence of a finite difference scheme to the Aleksandrov solution of (1.1) has been addressed in [2] in the case where the measure ν is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The proof of convergence given in this paper, for the

The author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1319640.

more general case where ν is a finite Borel measure, is a convergence in the classical sense by contrast with the approach in [2] where regularizations of the data and the domain, up to machine precision, have been used. Methods for which convergence is proved in this paper are not consistent, c.f. Remark 3.16.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we collect some notation used throughout the paper and recall the notion of Aleksandrov solution. In section 3, we present our discrete analogues and prove key weak convergence results for our discretizations of the normal mapping. In section 4 we prove our main claim, which is that the Aleksandrov solution is the uniform limit on compact subsets of mesh functions which solve our finite difference equations. The case of the so-called second boundary condition will be discussed in a subsequent paper.

2. Preliminaries

We use the notation $||.||$ for the Euclidean norm of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $|.|_\infty$ for the maximum norm. Let h be a small positive parameter and let

$$\mathbb{Z}_h^d = \{\, mh, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d \,\},$$

denote the orthogonal lattice with mesh length h. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_h$ the linear space of mesh functions, i.e. real-valued functions defined on $\mathbb{Z}_h^d$.

Following [14], for $v_h \in \mathcal{M}_h$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_h^d$, we define the second order directional difference operator

$$\Delta_e : \mathbb{Z}_h^d \to \mathbb{R}, \Delta_e v_h(x) = v_h(x+e) - 2v_h(x) + v_h(x-e).$$

Let also $(r_1, \ldots, r_d)$ denote the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. We define

$$\Omega_h = \{\, x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d, x \pm hr_i \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d, \forall i = 1, \ldots, d \,\}, \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\partial\Omega_h = \{\, x \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d, x \notin \Omega_h \,\}. \tag{2.2}$$

For a function $p \in C(\Omega)$ we define its restriction $r_h(p)$ to Ω_h by

$$r_h(p)(x) = p(x), x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h.$$

The restriction of $p \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ to $\partial\Omega_h$ is defined similarly.

We say that a mesh function v_h is *discrete convex* if and only if $\Delta_e v_h(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \Omega_h$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ for which $\Delta_e v_h(x)$ is defined. Let us denote by $\mathcal{C}_h$ the cone of discrete convex mesh functions.

We provide in this paper a theoretical link between the finite difference approach to the Monge-Ampère equation [6] and the geometric approach [18, 7]. See formula 3.1. Here we recall the discretization of $\det D^2 u$ of [6]. We define

$$V = \{\, (e_1, \ldots, e_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_h^d, (e_1, \ldots, e_d) \text{ is an orthogonal basis of } \mathbb{R}^d \,\},$$

and a discrete Monge-Ampère operator as

$$M_h^0[v_h](x) = \inf_{\substack{(e_1,\ldots,e_d)\in V \\ x\pm e_i \in \overline{\Omega}\cap\mathbb{Z}_h^d \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{||e_i||} \Delta_{e_i} v_h(x), x \in \Omega_h.$$

The operator $1/h^d M_h^0[v_h]$ is shown to be consistent in [6]. If we define for $x \in \Omega_h$

$$\lambda_{1,h}[v_h](x) = \min_{e \in \mathbb{Z}_h^d} \frac{\Delta_e v_h(x)}{||e||^2},$$

then $v_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$ if and only if $\lambda_h[v_h] \geq 0$.

2.1. **Aleksandrov solutions.** The material in this subsection is taken from [9] to which we refer for proofs. Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let us denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 2.1. *Let $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. The normal mapping of u, or subdifferential of u is the set-valued mapping $\partial u : \Omega \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ defined by*

$$\partial u(x_0) = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d : u(x) \geq u(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0), \text{ for all } x \in \Omega \,\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Given $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, the local subdifferential of u is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_l u(x_0) = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists \,&\text{a neighborhood } U_{x_0} \text{ of } x_0 \text{ such that} \\ &u(x) \geq u(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0), \text{ for all } x \in U_{x_0} \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly for all $x_0 \in \Omega$ we have $\partial u(x_0) \subset \partial_l u(x_0)$. Moreover

Lemma 2.2 ([8] Exercise 1)**.** *If Ω is convex and u is convex on Ω, then $\partial u(x) = \partial_l u(x)$ for all $x \in \Omega$.*

Let $|E|$ denote the Lebesgue measure of the measurable subset $E \subset \Omega$. For $E \subset \Omega$, we define

$$\partial u(E) = \cup_{x \in E} \partial u(x).$$

Theorem 2.3 ([9] Theorem 1.1.13)**.** *If u is continuous on Ω, the class*

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\, E \subset \Omega, \partial u(E) \text{ is Lebesgue measurable} \,\},$$

is a Borel σ-algebra and the set function $M[u] : \mathcal{S} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined by

$$M[u](E) = |\partial u(E)|,$$

is a measure, finite on compact subsets, called the Monge-Ampère measure associated with the function u.

We can now define the notion of Aleksandrov solution of the Monge-Ampère equation.

Definition 2.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be open and convex. Given a Borel measure ν on Ω, a convex function $u \in C(\Omega)$ is an Aleksandrov solution of*

$$\det D^2 u = \nu,$$

if the associated Monge-Ampère measure $M[u]$ is equal to ν.

We recall an existence and uniqueness result for the solution of (1.1).

Proposition 2.5 ([11] Theorem 1.1)**.** *Let Ω be a bounded convex domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Assume ν is a finite Borel measure and $g \in C(\partial\Omega)$ can be extended to a function $\tilde{g} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ which is convex in Ω. Then the Monge-Ampère equation* (1.1) *has a unique convex Aleksandrov solution in $C(\overline{\Omega})$.*

Definition 2.6. *A sequence μ_n of Borel measures converges to a Borel measure μ if and only if $\mu_n(B) \to \mu(B)$ for any Borel set B with $\mu(\partial B) = 0$.*

We note that there are several equivalent definitions of weak convergence of measures which can be found for example in [5, Theorem 1, section 1.9].

We make the usual convention of denoting by f a measure ν absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and with density f.

To a mesh function v_h one associates the normalized counting measure, also denoted by v_h by an abuse of notation

$$v_h(B) = h^d \sum_{x \in B \cap \Omega_h} v_h(x).$$

Definition 2.7. *We say that a family of mesh functions v_h converges to ν as measures if for any sequence $h_k \to 0$, the associated normalized counting measure v_{h_k} weakly converges to ν.*

2.2. **Solvability of finite difference equations.** Given a nonlinear equation $F[v] = 0$ with F real-valued, we denote by $F_h[v_h])(x) \equiv \hat{F}_h[v^h(x), v^h(y)|_{y \neq x}]$ a discretization of $F[v](x)$.

The scheme $F_h[v_h] = 0$ is monotone if for v_h and w_h in $\mathcal{M}_h$, $v_h(y) \geq w_h(y), y \neq x$ implies $\hat{F}_h[v_h(x), v_h(y)|_{y \neq x}] \geq \hat{F}_h[v_h(x), w_h(y)|_{y \neq x}]$.

The scheme is consistent if for all C^2 functions ϕ, and a sequence $x_h \to x \in \Omega$, $\lim_{h \to 0} F_h[r_h(\phi)](x_h) = F[\phi](x)$.

Let us now assume that the discretization takes the form

$$F_h[v_h](x) \equiv \tilde{F}_h[v_h(x), v_h(x) - v_h(y)|_{y \neq x, y \in N(x)}],$$

where $N(x)$ denotes the set of mesh points y on which $F_h[v_h](x)$ depend.

The scheme is degenerate elliptic if it is nondecreasing in each of the variables $v_h(x)$ and $v_h(x) - v_h(y), y \in N(x), y \neq x$. Given $x \in \Omega_h$, we now make the abuse of notation of denoting by F_h or $\hat{F}_h$ the function of the variables $v_h(x)$ and $v_h(x) - v_h(y), y \in N(x), y \neq x$.

The scheme is proper if there is $\delta > 0$ such that for $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^{N(x)}, x \in \Omega_h$, $x_0 \leq x_1$ implies $\hat{F}_h[x_0, y] - \hat{F}_h[x_1, y] \leq \delta(x_0 - x_1)$.

The scheme $F_h[v_h] = 0$ is Lipschitz continuous if there is $K > 0$ such that for all $x \in \Omega_h$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{N(x)+1}$

$$|\hat{F}_h[\alpha] - \hat{F}_h[\beta]| \leq K|\alpha - \beta|_\infty.$$

One shows that a degenerate elliptic scheme is monotone [16].

Lemma 2.8. [16, Theorem 7] *For a scheme which is degenerate elliptic and Lipschitz continuous, the equation $F_h[v_h] = 0$ has a solution.*

Remark 2.9. *The above lemma is a simple consequence of the approach in* [16] *and the Browder/Göhde/Kirk fixed point theorem* [12] *which asserts that a nonexpansive mapping on a nonempty closed convex bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ has a fixed point. Note that Lemma 2.8 does not address uniqueness. For this a sufficient condition is that the*

scheme is proper. Most schemes of interest are not proper and it is proposed in [16] *to consider the perturbation* $F_h[v_h] + \epsilon v_h$ *where* $\epsilon > 0$ *is close to the discretization error. Without loss of generality, following the approach in* [1]*, we can take* ϵ *as small as machine precision. Under this assumption, the discrete problem has a unique solution to which converges the iteration*

$$v_{h,k+1} = v_{h,k} - \nu(F_h[v_{h,k}] + \epsilon v_{h,k}),$$

for ν *sufficiently small.*

Definition 2.10. *Let* $u_h \in \mathcal{M}_h$ *for each* $h > 0$*. We say that* u_h *converges to a convex function* u *uniformly on compact subsets of* Ω *if and only if for each compact set* $K \subset \Omega$*, each sequence* $h_k \to 0$ *and for all* $\epsilon > 0$*, there exists* $h_{-1} > 0$ *such that for all* h_k*,* $0 < h_k < h_{-1}$*, we have*

$$\max_{x \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k}} |u_{h_k}(x) - u(x)| < \epsilon.$$

We will also use the following result.

Lemma 2.11. *Let* $v_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$ *denote a sequence of discrete convex functions which converges uniformly on compact subsets to a function* v*. Then the function* v *is convex.*

Proof. We recall that a function $\phi \in C^2(\Omega)$ is convex on Ω if the Hessian matrix $D^2\phi$ is positive semidefinite or $-\lambda_1[\phi] \leq 0$ where $\lambda_1[\phi]$ denotes the smallest eigenvalue of the Hessian matrix $D^2\phi$. This notion was extended to continuous functions in [17]. See also the remarks on [19, p. 226]. A continuous function u is convex in the viscosity sense if and only if it is a viscosity solution of $-\lambda_1[u] \leq 0$, that is, for all $\phi \in C^2(\Omega)$, whenever x_0 is a local minimum point of $u - \phi$, $-\lambda_1[\phi] \leq 0$.

Moreover, a function convex in the viscosity sense is convex. See for example [15, Proposition 4.1].

We recall that for $v_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, $-\lambda_{1,h}[v_h] \leq 0$. Now, the operator $\lambda_{1,h}[v_h]$ is easily seen to be degenerate elliptic, hence monotone. In addition it is consistent. Arguing as in the proof of [1, Theorem 4.2], one concludes that the limit function v is convex in the viscosity sense, and hence convex.

□

3. Partial Monge-Ampère measures associated to a mesh function

In this section we present discrete analogues of the normal mapping.

3.1. **First discretization of the normal mapping.** For a mesh function $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, a partial discrete normal mapping of u_h at the point $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_h$ is defined as

$$\partial^1_h u_h(x) = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d : \forall (e_1, \ldots, e_d) \in V, u_h(x) - u_h(x - e_i) \leq p \cdot e_i \leq u_h(x + e_i) - u_h(x),$$
$$i = 1, \ldots, d \,\text{provided}\, x \pm e_i \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_h \,\}.$$

For convenience, we will often omit the mention that we need $x \pm e_i \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_h$ in the definition of $\partial^1_h u_h(x)$.

Thus for $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$, and $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, we have for $p \in \partial_h^1 u_h(x)$,

$$u_h(y) \geq u_h(x) + p \cdot (y - x), \text{ for } y \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d,$$

provided $y - x$ can be completed to form an orthogonal basis $(e_1, \ldots, e_d)$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $x \pm e_i \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ for all i. This restriction motivates our characterization of $\partial_h^1 u_h(x)$ as a partial discrete normal mapping. Compare with (2.3).

For the results proved in this paper, the next lemma essentially says that our notion of discrete normal mapping is sufficient.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that the ball $B_\epsilon(x_0)$ in the maximum norm is contained in Ω. Then for h sufficiently small and $x_h, z_h \in B_{\epsilon/4}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$, the vector $x_h - z_h$ can be completed to form an orthogonal basis $(e_1, \ldots, e_d)$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $x_h \pm e_i \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ for all i.*

It follows that for $p \in \partial_h^1 u_h(x_h)$

$$u_h(z_h) \geq u_h(x_h) + p \cdot (z_h - x_h), \forall z_h \in B_{\epsilon/4}(x_0) \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $x_h = (a_i h)_{i=1,\ldots,d}$ and $z_h = (b_i h)_{i=1,\ldots,d}$. By assumption

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,d} |a_i - b_i| h \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Put $e_1 = x_h - z_h$ and assume that $(e_1, \ldots, e_d)$ is an orthogonal basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Since e_i for $i = 2, \ldots, d$ is obtained from e_1 by a rotation of angle $\pi/2$, we have $e_i^j = c_j h, j = 1, \ldots, d$ for some integer c_j where we denote by e_i^j the jth component of e_i. Since a rotation is an isometry, we have for all i, $\max_{j=1,\ldots,d} |e_i^j| h \leq \epsilon/2$. On the other hand

$$|(x_h^j + e_i^j) - x_0^j| \leq |x_h^j - x_0^j| + |e_i^j| \leq \epsilon,$$

and thus $x_h \pm e_i \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ for all i. This concludes the proof. □

Given $(e_1, \ldots, e_d) \in V$ and $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, the volume of the set

$$\{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d, u_h(x) - u_h(x - e_i) \leq p \cdot e_i \leq u_h(x + e_i) - u_h(x), i = 1, \ldots, d \,\},$$

is given, using standard facts of linear algebra, by

$$\frac{1}{||\det(e_i)||} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \Delta_{e_i} u_h(x),$$

where we denote by $\det(e_i)$ the determinant of the matrix with column vectors $e_i, i = 1, \ldots, d$, i.e. the determinant of the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} e_1 \ldots e_d \end{pmatrix}$. Since for an orthogonal basis, we have $\det(e_i) = \prod_{i=1}^d ||e_i||$, we get

$$|\partial_h^1 u_h(x_0)| \leq M_h^0[u_h](x_0). \tag{3.1}$$

For a subset $E \subset \Omega$, we define

$$\partial_h^1 u_h(E) = \cup_{x \in E \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d} \partial_h^1 u_h(x),$$

and define a Monge-Ampère measure associated with a discrete convex mesh function as

$$M_h^1[u_h](E) = |\partial_h^1 u_h(E)|,$$

for a Borel set E.

We prove in Lemma 3.7 below that $\partial_h^1 u_h(E)$ is Lebesgue measurable and in Lemma 3.8 below that $M_h^1[u_h]$ defines a Borel measure.

Note that for $|E|$ sufficiently small and $x \in E$, we have $M_h^1[u_h](E) = |\partial_h^1 u_h(x)|$. We will make the abuse of notation

$$M_h^1[u_h](\{x\}) = M_h^1[u_h](x).$$

In two dimension, and on a 9-point stencil, $|\partial_h^1 u_h(x)|$ takes a very elegant form.

Lemma 3.2. *For $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, the volume of the set*

$$\begin{aligned} S = \Bigg\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^2, \frac{u_h(x) - u_h(x - he_i)}{h} \le p \cdot e_i \le \frac{u_h(x + he_i) - u_h(x)}{h}, i = 1, 2 \\ \frac{u_h(x) - u_h(x - he_1 - he_2)}{h} \le p \cdot (e_1 + e_2) \le \frac{u_h(x + he_1 + he_2) - u_h(x)}{h} \\ \frac{u_h(x) - u_h(x - he_1 + he_2)}{h} \le p \cdot (e_1 - e_2) \le \frac{u_h(x + he_1 - he_2) - u_h(x)}{h} \Bigg\}, \end{aligned}$$

is given by

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2} \frac{u_h(x + he_i) - 2u_h(x) + u_h(x - he_i)}{h}.$$

Proof. The set S can equivalently be described as the set of vectors $p = (p_1, p_2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 \le hp_1 \le a_2, \quad a_3 \le hp_1 \le a_4 \\ b_1 \le hp_2 \le b_2, \quad b_3 \le hp_2 \le b_4, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 = u_h(x) - u_h(x - he_1), a_2 = u_h(x + he_1) - u_h(x) \\ b_1 = u_h(x) - u_h(x - he_2), b_2 = u_h(x + he_2) - u_h(x), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} a_3 &= u_h(x) - \frac{1}{2}(u_h(x - he_1 - he_2) + u_h(x - he_1 + he_2)) \\ a_4 &= \frac{1}{2}(u_h(x + he_1 + he_2) + u_h(x + he_1 - he_2)) - u_h(x) \\ b_3 &= u_h(x) - \frac{1}{2}(u_h(x - he_1 - he_2) + u_h(x + he_1 - he_2)) \\ b_4 &= \frac{1}{2}(u_h(x + he_1 + he_2) + u_h(x - he_1 + he_2)) - u_h(x). \end{aligned}$$

We prove that $a_3 \le a_1 \le a_2 \le a_4$. Similarly $b_3 \le b_1 \le b_2 \le b_4$. The result then follows.

By discrete convexity, $a_1 \le a_2$. Similarly

$$u_h(x + he_1) \le \frac{1}{2}(u_h(x + he_1 + he_2) + u_h(x + he_1 - he_2)).$$

This implies that $a_2 \leq a_4$. A similar argument gives $a_3 \leq a_1$. The proof is complete. □

For the solvability of the discrete Monge-Ampère equations, we need

Lemma 3.3. *For $x \in \Omega_h$, the operator $v_h \to M_h^1[v_h](x)$ is Lipschitz continuous and degenerate elliptic.*

Proof. From the definition of $\partial_h^1 v_h(x)$, $M_h^1[v_h](x)$ depends only on the differences $v_h(x \pm e_i) - v_h(x), i = 1, \ldots, d$ for an orthogonal basis $(e_1, \ldots, e_d)$. Moreover the volume of $\partial_h^1 v_h(x)$ increases as $v_h(x \pm e_i) - v_h(x)$ increases. This proves that $M_h^1[v_h](x)$ is degenerate elliptic.

We may write

$$M_h^1[v_h](x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} \Big(\min\{F_j[v_h](x), j \in J\} - \max\{G_j[v_h](x), j \in J\} \Big),$$

for some index set J and for operators $F_j, G_j, j \in J$ with values linear combinations of the values $v_h(y), y \in \Omega_h$, and hence Lipschitz continuous. See the proof of Lemma 3.2 for the simple case of a 9-point stencil. We conclude that $M_h^1[v_h](x)$ is also Lipschitz continuous.

□

We now establish that $M_h^1[u_h]$ does indeed define a Borel measure.

Lemma 3.4. *If Ω is bounded, $u_h \in \mathcal{M}_h$ and $F \subset \Omega$ is closed, then $\partial_h^1 u_h(F)$ is also closed.*

Proof. Recall that $\partial_h^1 u_h(F) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\{p_k\}$ be a sequence in $\partial_h^1 u_h(F)$ which converges to p_0. We show that $p_0 \in F$. For each k, let $x_k \in F \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ such that $p_k \in \partial_h^1 u_h(x_k)$. Since F is closed and bounded, we may assume that x_k converges to $x_0 \in F$. By definition, $\forall (e_1, \ldots, e_d) \in V, u_h(x_k) - u_h(x_k - e_i) \leq p_k \cdot e_i \leq u_h(x_k + e_i) - u_h(x_k), i = 1, \ldots, d$. As a bounded subset of $\mathbb{Z}_h^d$, $F \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ is a finite set and so $x_k = x_0$ for k sufficiently large. It follows that $u_h(x_0) - u_h(x_0 - e_i) \leq p_k \cdot e_i \leq u_h(x_0 + e_i) - u_h(x_0)$ for all i and hence $p_0 \in F$. □

Definition 3.5. *The discrete Legendre transform of a mesh function u_h is the function $u_h^* : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$u_h^*(p) = \sup_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d} (x \cdot p - u_h(x)).$$

As a supremum of affine functions, the discrete Legendre transform is convex and hence is differentiable almost everywhere, c.f. [9, Lemma 1.1.8]. This implies the following

Lemma 3.6. *If Ω is open, the set of points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which belongs to the discrete normal mapping image of more than one point of $\Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ is contained in a set of measure zero.*

Proof. The proof follows essentially the one of [9, Lemma 1.1.12]. □

The class

$$\mathcal{S}_h = \{\, E \subset \Omega, \partial_h^1 u_h(E) \text{ is Lebesgue measurable} \,\},$$

contains the closed sets by Lemma 3.4. Taking into account Lemma 3.6 we obtain.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that Ω is open and bounded. The class $\mathcal{S}_h$ is a σ-algebra which contains all closed sets of Ω. Therefore if E is a Borel subset of Ω and u_h is a mesh function, $\partial_h^1 u_h(E)$ is Lebesgue measurable.*

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as the corresponding one at the continuous level [3, p. 117–118]. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let Ω be open and bounded. For $E \subset \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$, we have*

$$M_h^1[u_h](E) = \sum_{x \in E} |\partial_h^1 u_h(x)|.$$

As a consequence $M_h^1[u_h]$ is σ-additive and thus defines a Borel measure.

Proof. Since Ω is bounded, the set E is finite. We can therefore write

$$E = \{\, x_i, i = 1, \ldots, N \,\},$$

for some integer N. Put $\partial_h^1 u_h(x_i) = H_i$.

The proof we give is similar to the proof of σ-additivity of the Monge-Ampère measure associated to a convex function [9, Theorem 1.1.13]. The difference is that here the sets H_i are not necessarily disjoint but have pairwise intersection of zero measure, Lemma 3.6. We have

$$\cup_{i=1}^N H_i = H_1 \cup (H_2 \setminus H_1) \cup (H_3 \setminus (H_2 \cup H_1)) \cup \ldots,$$

with the sets on the right hand side disjoints. Moreover

$$H_j = [H_j \cap (H_{j-1} \cup H_{j-2} \cup \ldots \cup H_1)] \cup [H_j \setminus (H_{j-1} \cup H_{j-2} \cup \ldots \cup H_1)].$$

But by Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6, $|H_j \cap (H_{j-1} \cup H_{j-2} \cup \ldots \cup H_1)| = 0$ and hence

$$|H_j| = |H_j \setminus (H_{j-1} \cup H_{j-2} \cup \ldots \cup H_1)|.$$

This implies that $|\cup_{i=1}^N H_i| = \sum_{i=1}^N |H_i|$ and proves the result. □

We now prove a weak convergence result for the Monge-Ampère measure M_h^1.

Lemmas 3.9–3.11 below are discrete analogues of [9, Lemma 1.2.2 and Lemma 1.2.3].

Lemma 3.9. *Assume that $u_h \to u$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω, with u convex and continuous. Then for $K \subset \Omega$ compact and any sequence $h_k \to 0$*

$$\limsup_{h_k \to 0} \partial_{h_k}^1 u_{h_k}(K) \subset \partial u(K).$$

Proof. Let

$$p \in \limsup_{h_k \to 0} \partial_{h_k}^1 u_{h_k}(K) = \cap_n \cup_{k \geq n} \partial_{h_k}^1 u_{h_k}(K).$$

Thus for each n, there exists k_n and $x_{k_n} \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$ such that $p \in \partial_{h_{k_n}}^1 u_{h_{k_n}}(x_{k_n})$. Let x_j denote a subsequence of x_{k_n} converging to $x_0 \in K$. We choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B_\epsilon(x_0) \subset \Omega$.

Since $p \in \partial^1_{h_j} u_{h_j}(x_j)$ for all j, we have by Lemma 3.1

$$u_{h_j}(z) \geq u_{h_j}(x_j) + p \cdot (z - x_j), \ \forall z \in B_{\frac{\epsilon}{4}}(x_0). \tag{3.2}$$

Next, note that

$$|u_{h_j}(x_j) - u(x_0)| \leq |u_{h_j}(x_j) - u(x_j)| + |u(x_j) - u(x_0)|.$$

By the convergence of x_j to x_0, the uniform continuity of u on K and the uniform convergence of u_h to u, we obtain $u_{h_j}(x_j) \to u(x_0)$ as $h_j \to 0$. Similarly $u_{h_j}(z) \to u(z)$ as $h_j \to 0$.

Taking pointwise limits in (3.2), we obtain

$$u(z) \geq u(x_0) + p \cdot (z - x_0) \ \forall z \in B_{\frac{\epsilon}{4}}(x_0).$$

We conclude that $p \in \partial_l u(K)$ and thus $p \in \partial u(K)$ by Lemma 3.1, since u is convex and Ω convex.

□

Lemma 3.10. *Assume that $u_h \to u$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω, with u convex and continuous. Assume that K is compact and U is open with $K \subset U \subset \overline{U} \subset \Omega$ and that for any sequence $h_k \to 0$, a subsequence k_j and $z_{k_j} \in \Omega$ with $z_{k_j} \to z_0 \in \partial\Omega$, we have*

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} u(z_{k_j}) \leq \limsup_{j\to\infty} u_{h_{k_j}}(z_{k_j}). \tag{3.3}$$

Then, up to a set of measure zero,

$$\partial u(K) \subset \liminf_{h_k \to 0} \partial^1_{h_k} u_{h_k}(U \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k}).$$

Proof. The proof we give here follows the lines of [10, Lemma 3.3]. Not all proofs of weak convergence of Monge-Ampère measures can be adapted to the discrete case.

Part 1 We define

$$A = \{ (x, p), x \in K, p \in \partial u(x) \},$$

and a mapping $v : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$v(z) = \sup_{(x,p)\in A} p \cdot (z - x) + u(x).$$

Note that v is defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and not just on Ω. Thus ∂v is defined with respect to $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. $\forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\partial v(z) = \{ p \in \mathbb{R}^d, v(y) \geq p \cdot (y - z) + v(z), \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d \}.$$

Note also that v takes values in $\mathbb{R}$ as Ω is bounded and u bounded on K. We have

$$u(z) \geq v(z) \quad \forall z \in \Omega. \tag{3.4}$$

For $(x, p) \in A$, $u(z) \geq u(x) + p \cdot (z - x), \forall z \in \Omega$, from which the relation follows.

We also have

$$u(z) = v(z) \quad \forall z \in K. \tag{3.5}$$

For $z \in K$ and $p \in \partial u(z)$, we have $(z, p) \in A$. And so $v(z) \geq u(z)$. By (3.4), we get (3.5).

Next we prove that

$$\partial v(x) = \partial u(x) \quad \forall x \in K. \tag{3.6}$$

Let $p \in \partial u(x)$. We have $(x,p) \in A$ and for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$v(z) \geq u(x) + p \cdot (z - x).$$

By (3.5), $u(x) = v(x)$ and we conclude that $p \in \partial v(x)$, i.e. $\partial u(x) \subset \partial v(x)$.

Let now $p \in \partial v(x)$ and $x \in K$. Using (3.4) and (3.5) we obtain for all $z \in \Omega$

$$u(z) \geq v(z) \geq u(x) + p \cdot (z - x),$$

which proves that $p \in \partial u(x)$ and thus we have $\partial v(x) \subset \partial u(x)$. This proves (3.6).

Part 2 We define

$$W = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d, p \in \partial v(x_1) \cap \partial v(x_2), \text{ for some } x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, x_1 \neq x_2 \,\}.$$

Since v is convex as the supremum of affine functions, by [9, Lemma 1.1.12], $|W| = 0$. Let $K \subset \Omega$ be compact and let $p \in \partial v(K) \setminus W$. By definition of W, there exists a unique $x_0 \in K$ such that $p \in \partial v(x_0)$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \neq x_0$ we have $p \notin \partial v(x)$. We claim that

$$v(x) > v(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0), x \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \neq x_0. \tag{3.7}$$

Otherwise $\exists x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d, x_1 \neq x_0$ such that $v(x_1) \leq v(x_0) + p \cdot (x_1 - x_0)$. But then for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &\geq v(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0) \\ &= v(x_0) + p \cdot (x_1 - x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_1) \\ &\geq v(x_1) + p \cdot (x - x_1), \end{aligned}$$

which gives $p \in \partial v(x_1)$, a contradiction.

Part 3 Recall that $K \subset U \subset \overline{U} \subset \Omega$ and for $k \geq 1$ let

$$\delta_k = \min_{x \in \overline{U} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k}} \{\, u_{h_k}(x) - p \cdot (x - x_0) \,\},$$

and

$$x_k = \operatorname*{argmin}_{x \in \overline{U} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k}} \{\, u_{h_k}(x) - p \cdot (x - x_0) \,\}.$$

We have

$$u_{h_k}(x) \geq u_{h_k}(x_k) + p \cdot (x - x_k), \forall x \in \overline{U} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k}. \tag{3.8}$$

We first prove that $x_k \to x_0$. Let x_{k_j} denote a subsequence converging to $\overline{x} \in \overline{U}$. We also consider a sequence $z_j \in \overline{U} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_{k_j}}$ such that $z_j \to x_0$. By the uniform convergence of u_h to u and the uniform continuity of u on $\overline{U}$, we have

$$u_{h_{k_j}}(z_j) \to u(x_0), \text{ and } u_{h_{k_j}}(x_{k_j}) \to u(\overline{x}).$$

For example

$$|u_{h_{k_j}}(x_{k_j}) - u(\overline{x})| \leq |u_{h_{k_j}}(x_{k_j}) - u(x_{k_j})| + |u(x_{k_j}) - u(\overline{x})|,$$

from which the claim follows. Therefore taking limits in (3.8), we obtain

$$u(x_0) \geq u(\overline{x}) + p \cdot (x_0 - \overline{x}).$$

If $\overline{x} \neq x_0$, we obtain by (3.4), (3.7) and (3.5)

$$u(x_0) \geq v(x_0) \geq v(\overline{x}) + p \cdot (x_0 - \overline{x}) > v(x_0) + p \cdot (\overline{x} - x_0) + p \cdot (x_0 - \overline{x}) = v(x_0) = u(x_0).$$

A contradiction. This proves that $x_k \to x_0$.

Part 4 We now claim that there exists k_0 such that (3.8) actually holds for all $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k}$ when $k \geq k_0$. Otherwise one can find a subsequence k_j and $z_{k_j} \in (\Omega \setminus \overline{U}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_{k_j}}$ such that

$$u_{h_{k_j}}(z_{k_j}) < u_{h_{k_j}}(x_{k_j}) + p \cdot (z_{k_j} - x_{k_j}). \tag{3.9}$$

Since Ω is bounded, up to a subsequence, we may assume that $z_{k_j} \to z_0 \in \overline{\Omega} \setminus U$. We show that

$$v(z_0) \leq v(x_0) + p \cdot (z_0 - x_0). \tag{3.10}$$

Case 1: $z_0 \in \Omega \setminus U$. Using the uniform convergence of u_h to u, the uniform continuity of u on $\overline{U}$ and taking limits in (3.9), we obtain $u(z_0) \leq u(x_0) + p \cdot (z_0 - x_0)$. By (3.5), $u(x_0) = v(x_0)$ and by (3.4), $v(z_0) \leq u(z_0)$. This gives (3.10).

Case 2: $z_0 \in \partial\Omega \setminus U$. Now we have

$$\limsup_{j \to \infty} u_{h_{k_j}}(z_{k_j}) \leq v(x_0) + p \cdot (z_0 - x_0).$$

Note that v is lower semi-continuous as the supremum of affine functions. Using the assumption (3.3) and (3.4), we obtain

$$\limsup_{j \to \infty} u_{h_{k_j}}(z_{k_j}) \geq \liminf_{j \to \infty} u(z_{k_j}) \geq \liminf_{j \to \infty} v(z_{k_j}) \geq v(z_0).$$

Hence (3.10) also holds in this case.

Part 5 Finally we note that (3.10) contradicts (3.7) and therefore (3.9) cannot hold, i.e. (3.8) actually holds for all $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k}$ when $k \geq k_0$. But this means that $p \in \cup_n \cap_{k \geq n} \partial^1_{h_k} u_{h_k}(U \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_{h_k})$ and concludes the proof.

□

Lemma 3.11. *Assume that $u_h \to u$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω, with u convex and continuous. Then $M^1_h[u_h]$ tend to $M[u]$ weakly.*

Proof. By an equivalence criteria of weak convergence of measures, c.f. for example [5, Theorem 1, section 1.9], it is enough to show that for any sequence $h_k \to 0$, a compact subset $K \subset \Omega$ and an open subset $U \subset \Omega$, we have

$$\limsup_{h_k \to 0} M^1_h[u_{h_k}](K) \leq M[u](K) \text{ and } M[u](U) \leq \liminf_{h_k \to 0} M^1_h[u_{h_k}](U).$$

The first relation follows from Lemma 3.9. Since any open set of $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be written as a countable union of closed subsets, the second relation follows from Lemma 3.10. □

3.2. **Second discretization of the normal mapping.** We now consider a second discrete analogue of the normal mapping closely related to the first. It turns out that it yields the discretization introduced in [4]. We define

$$\partial_h^2 u_h(x) = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d : \forall e \in \mathbb{Z}_h^d, u_h(x) - u_h(x-e) \le p \cdot e \le u_h(x+e) - u_h(x), \\ \text{provided } x \pm e \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d \,\}.$$

Thus for $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$, and $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, we have for $p \in \partial_h^2 u_h(x)$,

$$u_h(y) \ge u_h(x) + p \cdot (y - x), \text{ for } y \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d,$$

provided $2x - y \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$.

We have the following analogue of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that the ball $B_\epsilon(x_0)$ in the maximum norm is contained in Ω. Then for h sufficiently small and $x_h, z_h \in B_{\epsilon/4}(x_0) \cap \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$, $2x_h - z_h \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d$.*

It follows that for $p \in \partial_h^2 u_h(x_h)$

$$u_h(z_h) \ge u_h(x_h) + p \cdot (z_h - x_h).$$

Proof. We have

$$|2x_h - z_h - x_0|_\infty = |(x_h - z_h) + (x_h - x_0)|_\infty \le \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} < \epsilon,$$

which proves the result. □

For a subset $E \subset \Omega$, we define

$$\partial_h^2 u_h(E) = \cup_{x \in E \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d} \partial_h^2 u_h(x),$$

and define a Monge-Ampère measure associated with a discrete convex mesh function as

$$M_h^2[u_h](E) = |\partial_h^2 u_h(E)|,$$

for a Borel set E. The proof that $\partial_h^2 u_h(E)$ is measurable and that $M_h^2[u_h]$ defines a Borel measure is identical to the proofs of Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8.

The analogues of Lemmas 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 also hold for $\partial_h^2 u_h$. In summary, we have

Lemma 3.13. *Assume that $u_h \to u$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω, with u convex and continuous. Then $M_h^2[u_h]$ tend to $M[u]$ weakly.*

Remark 3.14. *We note that $\partial_h^2 u_h(x) \subset \partial_h^1 u_h(x)$ and thus using* (3.1)*, we get*

$$M_h^2[u_h](x) \le M_h^1[u_h](x) \le M_h^0[u_h](x),$$

which suggests that the operator M_h^2 leads to a more accurate approximation of the normal mapping. In fact, our numerical experiments indicate that for the 9-point stencil associated with M_h^1 a very good initial guess is required for solving the discrete nonlinear equations with a time marching iterative method.

On the other hand, at points where it is known that $M_h^2[u_h](x) = 0$, one may use $M_h^0[u_h](x) = 0$. This is the approach taken in [4].

Analogous to Lemma 3.3, we also have

Lemma 3.15. *For $x \in \Omega_h$, the operator $v_h \to M_h^2[v_h](x)$ is Lipschitz continuous and degenerate elliptic.*

Following a strategy similar to the one used in [4], we can rewrite $\partial_h^2 u_h(x)$ using polar coordinates and in dimension $d = 2$.

Let $e \in \mathbb{Z}_h^2$ such that $x \pm e \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^2$. Put $e = |e|e^{i\theta'}$ and note that $-e = |e|e^{i(\theta'+\pi)}$.

The condition $u_h(x) - u_h(x-e) \leq p \cdot e \leq u_h(x+e) - u_h(x)$ is equivalent to $u_h(x) - u_h(x-(-e)) \leq p \cdot (-e) \leq u_h(x+(-e)) - u_h(x)$. Thus we may restrict θ' to be in an interval of length π.

Let $\theta'_j, j = 1, \ldots, N$ denote a set of directions such that $e_j = |e_j|e^{i\theta'_j}$ is the vector of smallest length such that $x \pm e_j \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^2$. We may assume that all θ'_j are in an interval of length π.

We note that if $x + re_j \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^2$, then r must be an integer. Put $e_j = (kh, mh)$ for integers k and m. Then $rk = k'$ and $rm = m'$ for integer k' and m'. Thus r must be a rational number. Assume $r = a/b$ with a and b having no common divisors. Then b must divide both k and m. By the assumption on e_j, we conclude that $b = 1$ proving that r is an integer.

Next, since $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, the condition $u_h(x) - u_h(x-e_j) \leq p \cdot e_j \leq u_h(x+e_j) - u_h(x)$ implies $u_h(x) - u_h(x-2e_j) \leq 2p \cdot e_j \leq u_h(x+2e_j) - u_h(x)$ and hence by induction $u_h(x) - u_h(x-re_j) \leq rp \cdot e_j \leq u_h(x+re_j) - u_h(x)$.

We can therefore write

$$\partial_h^2 u_h(x) = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \forall j = 1, \ldots, N, u_h(x) - u_h(x-e_j) \leq p \cdot e_j \leq u_h(x+e_j) - u_h(x) \,\}.$$

Now put $p = re^{i\theta}, r \in (0, \infty) \times [0, 2\pi)$. The $p \in \partial_h^2 u_h(x)$ if and only if

$$u_h(x) - u_h(x-e_j) \leq r|e_j| \cos(\theta - \theta'_j) \leq u_h(x+e_j) - u_h(x), j = 1, \ldots, N.$$

If $\theta = \theta'_j \pm \pi/2$, the above condition is vacuously true since $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$. We may thus assume that $\theta'_j \in (\theta - \pi/2, \theta + \pi/2)$. It follows that $u_h(x+e_j) - u_h(x) \geq 0$.

Define

$$R_-[u_h](x,\theta) = \sup_{j=1,\ldots,N} \frac{u_h(x) - u_h(x-e_j)}{|e_j| \cos(\theta - \theta'_j)}$$
$$R_+[u_h](x,\theta) = \inf_{j=1,\ldots,N} \frac{u_h(x+e_j) - u_h(x)}{|e_j| \cos(\theta - \theta'_j)}.$$

By the assumption $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, we have $R_-[u_h](x,\theta) \leq R_+[u_h](x,\theta)$. We have

$$\partial_h^2 u_h(x) = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \forall j = 1, \ldots, N, R_-[u_h](x,\theta) \leq r \leq R_+[u_h](x,\theta) \,\}.$$

It follows that

$$|\partial_h^2 u_h(x)| = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{2}\big(R_+[u_h](x,\theta)^2 - \max\{R_-[u_h](x,\theta), 0\}^2\big)\, d\theta.$$

To evaluate numerically the integral, let $\eta_k, k = 1, \ldots, M$ denote a partition of $[0, 2\pi)$ with $\eta_1 = 0$ and $\eta_M = 2\pi$. Then

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \frac{1}{2}(\eta_{k+1} - \eta_k)\big(R_+[u_h](x, \eta_k)^2 - \max\{R_-[u_h](x, \eta_k), 0\}^2\big) \to |\partial_h^2 u_h(x)|.$$

Benamou and Froese [4] proposed to use for η_j, the discretization $\{\, \theta_j, j = 1, \ldots, N \,\} \cup \{\, \theta_j + \pi, j = 1, \ldots, N \,\}$ and enforce the convexity condition directly in the discretization. We define

$$M_h^3[u_h](x) = \sum_{k=1}^{2N-1} \frac{1}{2}(\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k) \max\big(R_+[u_h](x, \theta_k)^2 - \max\{R_-[u_h](x, \theta_k), 0\}^2, 0\big).$$

If $u_h \to u$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω, $\lim_{h\to 0} M_h^2[u_h](x) = |\partial u(x)|$ and we have $\lim_{h\to 0} M_h^3[u_h](x) - M_h^2[u_h](x) = 0$. It follows that

$$\lim_{h\to 0} M_h^3[u_h](x) = |\partial u(x)|. \tag{3.11}$$

Remark 3.16. *Since for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, and $x \in \Omega_h$ we have $\lim_{h\to 0} M_h^i[r_h v](x) = M[v](x)$ for a C^2 function v and because $M[v](x) = |\partial v(x)| = |\{\, Dv(x) \,\}| = 0$, the methods for which convergence is proved in this paper are not consistent.*

4. Convergence of discretizations to the Aleksandrov solution

The discrete Monge-Ampère equation is given by: find $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$ such that for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$

$$\begin{aligned} M_h^i[u_h](x) &= h^d f_h(x), x \in \Omega_h \\ u_h(x) &= r_h(\tilde{g})(x), x \in \partial\Omega_h. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

We recall that f_h is a sequence of mesh functions which converge weakly to ν as measures. We require that

$$h^d \sum_{x\in\Omega_h} f_h(x) \le A, \tag{4.2}$$

with A independent of h.

For $x \in \Omega$ we denote by $d(x, \partial\Omega)$ the distance of x to $\partial\Omega$. For a subset S of Ω, $\mathrm{diam}(S)$ denotes its diameter.

We were somewhat guided in the proof of the following lemma by the proof of Aleksandrov's maximum principle and the approach in [13].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$. Then*

$$\max_{x\in\Omega_h} |u_h(x)| \le C\bigg(\sum_{x\in\Omega_h} M_h^2[u_h](x)\bigg)^{\frac{1}{d}},$$

where the constant C depends only on the diameter of Ω and the dimension d.

Proof. Put $\alpha = \max_{x\in\Omega_h} |u_h(x)|$ and let us assume that $\Omega \subset B_\Delta(0), \Delta > 0$. Define

$$A = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d, ||p|| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2\Delta} \,\}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d_h$ we have

$$|p \cdot x| \leq ||p||\ ||x|| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Let β be a positive number such that $\beta > 3/2\alpha$. We have

$$p \cdot x - \beta \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} - \beta < -\alpha \leq u_h(x), \forall x \in \Omega_h.$$

We can therefore define

$$\beta_0 = \inf\{\, \beta > 0, p \cdot x - \beta \leq u_h(x), \forall x \in \Omega_h \,\}.$$

We necessarily have $p\cdot x_0 - \beta_0 = u_h(x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in \Omega_h$. We claim that $p \in \partial^2_h u_h(x_0)$. Since

$$p \cdot (x_0 \pm e) - \beta_0 \leq u_h(x_0 \pm e),$$

we get using $-\beta_0 = u_h(x_0) - p \cdot x_0$, $p \cdot (\pm e) \leq u_h(x_0 \pm e) - u_h(x_0)$ which gives the result.

We therefore have

$$A \subset \partial^2_h u_h(x_0) \subset \cup_{x\in\Omega_h} \partial^2_h u_h(x).$$

Since the volume of A is $C\alpha^d$ for a constant C which depends only on Δ and d, we have

$$C\alpha^d \leq \big|\cup_{x\in\Omega_h} \partial^2_h u_h(x)\big| \leq \sum_{x\in\Omega_h} M^2_h[u_h](x),$$

from which the result follows. □

The next lemma says that bounded discrete convex functions are locally equicontinuous.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$ is bounded. Then the family u_h is locally equicontinuous, i.e. for each compact subset $K \subset \Omega$, there exists $C_K > 0$ such that*

$$|u_h(x) - u_h(y)| \leq C_K|x - y|,\ \forall x, y \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_h.$$

Proof. We note that ∂^i_h for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$ are simply partial discrete analogues of the normal mapping. We define for $x_0 \in \Omega_h$

$$\partial_h u_h(x_0) = \{\, p \in \mathbb{R}^d : u_h(x) \geq u_h(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0), \text{ for all } x \in \Omega_h \,\}.$$

We first prove that for $p \in \partial_h u_h(x_0)$

$$||p|| \leq \frac{2\max\{\, u_h(x), x \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_h \,\}}{d(x_0, \partial\Omega)}.$$

Let $x_k \in \Omega, k \geq 1$ such that $x_k - x_0 = ||x_k - x_0||\, p/||p||$. Extending u_h by linear interpolation, we obtain

$$u_h(x_k) \geq u_h(x_0) + ||p||\, ||x_k - x_0||.$$

This gives $||p|| \leq 2\max\{\, u_h(x), x \in \overline{\Omega} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_h \,\}/||x_k - x_0||$. Choosing the sequence x_k such that $||x_k - x_0|| \to d(x_0, \partial\Omega)$ gives the result.

We conclude that for $p \in \partial_h(K \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d)$, $||p||$ is uniformly bounded in h. Arguing as in the proof of [9, Lemma 1.1.6], we obtain the local equicontinuity.

□

We may argue by Remark 2.9, that a solution of (4.1) is unique up to adding a vanishing term $\epsilon(h)u_h$ with $\epsilon(h)$ close to machine precision or with $\epsilon(h) \to 0$ as $h \to 0$.

We can now state the main result of this paper

Theorem 4.3. *Problem* (4.1) *has a unique solution* u_h *and* u_h *converges uniformly on compact subsets of* Ω *to the unique Aleksandrov solution of* (1.1).

Proof. By Lemmas 2.8, 3.3 and 3.15, (4.1) has a solution which is unique up to adding a vanishing term $\epsilon(h)u_h$. By Assumption (4.2) and Lemma 4.1, the solution is uniformly bounded on Ω_h. We then obtain by Lemma 4.2 that u_h is locally equicontinuous. By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, there exists a subsequence u_{h_k} which converges uniformly on compact subsets to a function v. Since $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$ the function v is convex by Lemma 2.11. By the stability property, the function v is locally bounded and hence continuous on Ω. By the weak convergence result Lemma 3.9, we have $M[v] = \nu$. Since $u_h = g$ on $\partial\Omega$ we get $v = g$ on $\partial\Omega$.

To prove that v is continuous up to the boundary, we first prove that for $\zeta \in \partial\Omega$, $\lim_{x\to\zeta} v(x) \geq g(\zeta)$ by arguing as in the proof of [11, Lemma 5.1].

Let $\epsilon > 0$. By [11, Theorem 2.2] there exists an affine function L such that $L \leq g$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $L(\zeta) \geq g(\zeta) - \epsilon$. Put $z = v - L$. Since $v = g$ on $\partial\Omega$, we have $z \geq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. If $z \geq 0$ on Ω we obtain $\lim_{x\to\zeta} v(x) \geq g(\zeta)$. If $z(x) < 0$ for some $x \in \Omega$, by Aleksandrov's maximum principle [10, Proposition 6.15] applied to z on the convex set $\widetilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ where $z < 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}(-z(x))^d &\leq Cd(x, \partial\widetilde{\Omega})(\mathrm{diam}(\widetilde{\Omega}))^{d-1} M[v](\widetilde{\Omega}) \\ &\leq Cd(x, \partial\Omega)(\mathrm{diam}(\Omega))^{d-1} M[v](\Omega) \\ &\leq Cd(x, \partial\Omega) \leq C||x - \zeta||,\end{aligned}$$

and we make the usual abuse of notation of denoting by the same letter C various constants. Therefore

$$z(x) \geq -C||x - \zeta||^{\frac{1}{d}} \text{ on } \widetilde{\Omega} \text{ and } z(x) \geq 0 \text{ on } \Omega \setminus \widetilde{\Omega}.$$

We conclude that

$$v(x) \geq L(x) - C||x - \zeta|| \text{ on } \Omega.$$

Taking the limit as $x \to \zeta$ we obtain $\lim_{x\to\zeta} v(x) \geq g(\zeta)$.

Next, we prove that $\lim_{x\to\zeta} v(x) \leq g(\zeta)$. Since $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$, we have $\Delta_h u_h \geq 0$ where

$$\Delta_h v_h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{v_h(x + hr_i) - 2v_h(x) + v_h(x - hr_i)}{h^2}.$$

Let w_h denote the solution of the problem $\Delta_h w_h = 0$ on Ω_h with $w_h = \tilde{g}$ on $\partial\Omega_h$. We have $\Delta_h(u_h - w_h) \geq 0$ on Ω_h with $u_h - w_h = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_h$. By the discrete maximum principle for the discrete Laplacian, we have $u_h - w_h \leq 0$ on Ω_h. Since w_h converges

uniformly on compact subsets to the unique viscosity solution of $\Delta w = 0$ on Ω with $w = g$ on $\partial\Omega$, we obtain $v(x) \leq w(x)$ on Ω. But $w \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, using for example [20, Theorem 3.5]. To apply the latter theorem one needs to check that the convex function $\tilde{g}$ is subharmonic in the viscosity sense but this also follows from [15, Proposition 4.1]. We conclude that $\lim_{x\to\zeta} v(x) \leq g(\zeta)$. Thus $v \in C(\overline{\Omega})$.

Since $v \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, the function v is an Aleksandrov solution of (1.1). By unicity, $v = u$ and hence the whole family u_h converges uniformly on compact subsets to u.

□

Remark 4.4. *Let us consider the following problem discussed in* [4]*: find* $u_h \in \mathcal{C}_h$

$$\begin{aligned} M_h^3[u_h](x) &= f_h(x), x \in \cup_{l=1}^{L}\{ d_l \} \\ M_h^0[u_h](x) &= 0, x \in \Omega_h \setminus \cup_{l=1}^{K}\{ d_l \} \\ u_h(x) &= r_h(\tilde{g})(x), x \in \partial\Omega_h, \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where $d_l, l = 1, \ldots, L$ *are a finite number of given points in* Ω_h*. The solvability of* (4.3) *follows from Remark 3.14, and the fact that* $M_h^3[u_h]$ *is also degenerate elliptic and Lipschitz continuous. For uniqueness, one may as in Remark 2.9 assume that a vanishing term* $\epsilon\, u_h(x)$ *is added to the discretization to make it proper. The stability of the scheme, for* h *sufficiently small, follows from Lemma 4.1, and the fact that* $\lim_{h\to 0} M_h^3[u_h](d_l) - M_h^2[u_h](d_l) = 0$ *for each* l*. The result of Theorem 4.3 then also holds for* (4.3)*. We view Problem* (4.3) *as an implementation (with numerical errors) of the convergent method* (4.1)*.*

Remark 4.5. *Lemma 4.1 combined with Remark 3.14 yields a new proof of the stability of the discretization proposed in* [6]*. Unlike the proof outlined in* [1]*, stability holds under Assumption* (4.2) *and it is no longer necessary to assume that* f_h *is uniformly bounded in* h*.*

References

[1] Awanou, G.: Convergence of a hybrid scheme for the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation. http://homepages.math.uic.edu/ awanou/up.html

[2] Awanou, G.: On standard finite difference discretizations of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation (2014). http://homepages.math.uic.edu/˜awanou/up.html

[3] Bakelman, I.J.: Convex analysis and nonlinear geometric elliptic equations. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1994). With an obituary for the author by William Rundell, Edited by Steven D. Taliaferro

[4] Benamou, J.D., Froese, B.D.: A viscosity framework for computing Pogorelov solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation (2014). http://arxiv.org/pdf/1407.1300v2.pdf

[5] Evans, L.C., Gariepy, R.F.: Measure theory and fine properties of functions. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL (1992)

[6] Froese, B., Oberman, A.: Convergent finite difference solvers for viscosity solutions of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation in dimensions two and higher. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **49**(4), 1692–1714 (2011)

[7] Gu, X., Luo, F., Sun, J., Yau, S.T.: Variational principles for Minkowski type problems, discrete optimal transport, and discrete Monge-Ampere equations (2013). http://arxiv.org/pdf/1302.5472v1.pdf

[8] Gutiérrez, C.E.: KIT Lectures, April 2013. Exercises on the Monge-Ampère equation. https://math.temple.edu/˜gutierre/

[9] Gutiérrez, C.E.: The Monge-Ampère equation. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 44. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA (2001)
[10] Gutiérrez, C.E., van Nguyen, T.: On Monge-Ampère type equations arising in optimal transportation problems. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **28**(3), 275–316 (2007)
[11] Hartenstine, D.: The Dirichlet problem for the Monge-Ampère equation in convex (but not strictly convex) domains. Electron. J. Differential Equations pp. No. 138, 9 pp. (electronic) (2006)
[12] Jachymski, J.: Another proof of the Browder-Göhde-Kirk theorem via ordering argument. Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **65**(1), 105–107 (2002)
[13] Lawler, G.F.: Weak convergence of a random walk in a random environment. Comm. Math. Phys. **87**(1), 81–87 (1982/83)
[14] Lawler, G.F.: A discrete stochastic integral inequality and balanced random walk in a random environment. Duke Math. J. **50**(4), 1261–1274 (1983)
[15] Lindqvist, P., Manfredi, J., Saksman, E.: Superharmonicity of nonlinear ground states. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **16**(1), 17–28 (2000)
[16] Oberman, A.M.: Convergent difference schemes for degenerate elliptic and parabolic equations: Hamilton-Jacobi equations and free boundary problems. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **44**(2), 879–895 (electronic) (2006)
[17] Oberman, A.M.: The convex envelope is the solution of a nonlinear obstacle problem. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **135**(6), 1689–1694 (electronic) (2007)
[18] Oliker, V.I., Prussner, L.D.: On the numerical solution of the equation $(\partial^2 z/\partial x^2)(\partial^2 z/\partial y^2) - ((\partial^2 z/\partial x \partial y))^2 = f$ and its discretizations. I. Numer. Math. **54**(3), 271–293 (1988)
[19] Trudinger, N.S., Wang, X.J.: Hessian measures. I. Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **10**(2), 225–239 (1997). Dedicated to Olga Ladyzhenskaya
[20] Trudinger, N.S., Wang, X.J.: Hessian measures. II. Ann. of Math. (2) **150**(2), 579–604 (1999)

Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science, M/C 249. University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607-7045, USA

E-mail address: awanou@uic.edu

URL: http://www.math.uic.edu/~awanou